UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/627,252	07/28/2000	Joseph Skeffington Wholey III	07470-050001	2390

7590 06/16/2004

Kenyon S Jenckes
Fish & Richardson PC
4350 La Jolla Village Drive Suite 500
San Diago, CA 92122

EXAMINER	
AMINI, JAVID A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2672	13

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/627,252	WHOLEY III ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Javid A Amini	2672	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,8,9,11-14,16-18,21,22,24-27,29-31,34,35 and 37-39 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed March 15, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- Applicant on page 13 of remarks discloses the definition of "runtime" (i.e., the time an application is executed on a computer system). The values of runtime parameters may be supplied by the end user or to be externally supplied or a default value.
- Applicant on page 14 lines 14-21 argues that the reference Sheard does not teach the runtime parameters or of modifying graphs. Examiner's reply: Sheard in col. 34 lines 7-67 teaches runtime parameters under subject of runtime configurable. And also Sheard in col. 25 lines 37-49 teaches a charting module that is implemented to read the performance monitor log files and generates basic system management queue charts. The charting module also reads the statistic report files and generates basic business management statistic charts. The charting module is able to perform a number of other tasks, including displaying charts, taking snapshots of the report files periodically, and updating the charts dynamically. The time interval for chart updating is configurable. Before a chart is displayed, a configuration form is popped up to permit the input of various configurable parameters by the user, such as parameters associated with chart ranges and frequency of measurements. A chart is generated using the user configurable parameters. Shear in cols. 35 and 36 lines 1-16;1-15 suggested the

component configuration is created by the developer of a component at development time. There are four types of parameters, including non-configurable, static-configurable, runtime configurable, and project configurable parameters. Non-configurable parameters are parameters that are defined by the developer and are not intended to be modified at deployment time or runtime. Static configurable parameters are parameters whose default are set at component development time, but may be changed at deployment time, such as by providing overriding definitions in the <project name>.sxp file. Static configurable parameters are not intended to be change at runtime. Runtime configurable parameters are parameters that are copied on instance creation to the <inst name>.cfg file. These parameters can be modified at run-time through the visual interface and the new values of parameters are stored in the <inst name>.cfg file. Project configurable parameters are parameters that are copied from <component name>.cfg file to the <project name>.sxp file at project creation time, and can be modified in the <project name>.sxp file at runtime. It is noted that each component may have component-specific groups, and that these groups behave like runtime configurable parameters.

- Applicant on page 15 lines 1-14 argues that the reference does not teach programmatically retrieving runtime parameters. Examiner's reply: Shear in figs. 18-19 illustrates the distribution planning panel 550 retrieves and stores information from the project file. The canvas 540 of the main visual interface panel 501 also uses the project file. In this regard, the distribution planning panel

550 and canvas 540 of the main visual interface panel 501 represent the same deployment from two different perspectives. The distribution-planning panel 550 is used from the global navigation point of view, while the canvas 540 of the main visual interface panel 501 is used from the data flow point of view. And also see Sheard in col. 34 lines 7-67.

- Application on page 16 line 18 argues that the reference Shear does not suggest any structural change to a graph. Examiner's reply: Shear in col. 20, lines 32-44 teaches Clicking on one of the tabs 520, 522, 524, 526 alters the information shown on the canvas 540 and the operations effected in the canvas 540 as appropriate for the selected view. For example, double clicking on an adapter in the System Integration view (e.g., see FIG. 18) results in displaying of an invoked configuration utility for the selected adapter. In contrast, selection of the same adapter when the System Management view (e.g., see FIG. 21) is active results in displaying of any runtime errors associated with the adapter. By providing different views within an integrated visual framework, vertical consistency of the system and business layers of the integrated data solution is maintained.

Examiner's suggestion: Applicant should be able to extract and incorporate an equivalent and explicit language to teach clearly the claim invention from the following example. The Runtime, Global or Dynamic Parameters are generated during for example a search process and used to pass certain values to different process-segments. They are generated by the system and destroyed as soon as the search process ends. Advanced users can take advantage of this feature to make their result pages more interesting. Run-time parameters are also called as Global or

Dynamic parameters. Run-time Parameters can be used all over your 'html Template'. During the search process they are replaced with their Real Values. A user can create various Dynamic Linking options using them. Example of some Run-Time Variables:

1. $SEARCHRESULTS; **2.** ##QUERY##; **3.** ##ENCQUERY##; **4.** ##RNDNUM##; 5. Current Date Time.

Claim Objections

Claim 27 on page 9 line 24 objected to because of the following informalities: the last part of the claim 27 should be assigned as an (f). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 12-14, 16, 18, 22, 25-27, 29, 31, 35, and 38-39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheard et al. (herein after referred as a Sheard), in view of Poole et al. (herein after referred as a Poole).

1. Claim 1,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 18 and 20 illustrate the step of "a method for executing a graph representing an executable computer application, the graph having vertices representing components and links between components indicating flows of data between such components

the graph further having components with parameters, including: Poole in figs. 22 and 23 illustrates the steps. And also Sheard et al. in Fig. 21 illustrate the step of (a) programmatically retrieving a runtime parameter for the graph at runtime execution of the graph, the runtime parameter having a value defined as determinable at runtime execution of the graph", and also see Sheard et al. in Figs. 12 and 13, box 332. Sheard et al. in col. 3, lines 44-50 teach the step of "(b) determining whether the value for the runtime parameter is to be provided by user input or is to be externally supplied programmatically;", Sheard et al. in col. 24, lines 45-50 teach the step of "(c) displaying a prompt to a user for receiving user input for every runtime parameter so determined to be provided by user input;". Sheard et al. in Figs. 12 and 13, box 332 teach the step of "(d) retrieving any externally supplied value for every runtime parameters determined to be externally supplied programmatically; Sheard et al. in col. 25, lines 34-50 substantially teach the step of (e) determining a final parameter value based on one of the user input to such prompt or such externally supplied value or a default value;", and also Sheard et al. in col. 24, lines 45-50 substantially teach the step of "(f) executing the graph using the first final parameter value as the value for the runtime parameter". Sheard et al. do not explicitly teach the final parameter value of steps (e) and (f). However in view of Poole in col. 79 lines 22-33 teaches the final parameter value based on one of the user input of steps (e) and (f). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Poole into Sheard in order to have a combination of Sheard's methodology that employs a single intuitive user interface that provides various types of information to users having disparate data input and output requirements, with a significant advantage of the Poole's invention concerns the re-usability of textual, graphical, and other

components, thereby providing for the construction of any arbitrary document type having any arbitrary number of presentation formats.

1. Claim 3,

Sheard et al. in abstract teach the step of "providing an interface, which permits designating a parameter of a graph component as a runtime parameter".

2. Claim 5,

Sheard et al. in (col. 3, lines 27-44) teach the step of "the expression computes metadata".

3. Claim 9,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 18 and 20 illustrate the step of "a method for modifying a graph at runtime execution of the graph, having vertices representing components and links between components indicating flows of data between such components the graph having components with parameters, including: Sheard et al. in Fig. 21 illustrate the step of "(a) determining at runtime execution of the graph whether any component of the an associated graph is defined as being a conditional component having an associated condition and a condition interpretation". Sheard et al. in col. 3, lines 44-50 teach the step of "(b) evaluating the associated condition for every such conditional component". Sheard et al. in col. 24, lines 45-50 teach the step of "(c) modifying the graph at runtime execution of the graph in accordance with such evaluation and the corresponding associated condition-interpretation of at least one such conditional component by removing such conditional component and all connected flows to such conditional component from the graph before execution of the graph, based on a first evaluation of the associated condition and the corresponding associated condition-interpretation for such conditional component; and (d) executing the modified graph". But Sheard et al. do not explicitly teach the

use of final parameter value in step (D). However in view of Poole in col. 79 lines 22-33 teaches the final parameter value based on one of the user input. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Poole into Sheard in order to have a combination of Sheard's methodology that employs a single intuitive user interface that provides various types of information to users having disparate data input and output requirements, with a significant advantage of the Poole's invention concerns the re-usability of textual, graphical, and other components, thereby providing for the construction of any arbitrary document type having any arbitrary number of presentation formats.

4. Claim 12,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 23 and 24 teach the step of "A method for modifying a graph at runtime execution of the graph, including: determining at runtime execution of the graph whether any component of the graph is defined as being a conditional component having a an associated condition and an associated condition-interpretation; evaluating the associated condition for every such conditional component; modifying the graph at runtime execution of the graph in accordance with such evaluation and the corresponding associated condition-interpretation of at least one such conditional component by replacing such conditional component with a flow before execution of the graph based on a second evaluation of the associated condition and the corresponding condition interpretation for such conditional component; and executing the modified graph". See also rejection of claim 1.

5. Claim 13,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 23 and 24 teach the step of "further including an interface which permits designating a condition and a condition interpretation for a graph component".

6. Claim 14,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 18 and 20 illustrate the step of "a system for executing a graph representing an executable computer application, the graph, having vertices representing components and links between components indicating flows of data between such components the graph further having components with parameters, including: Sheard et al. in Fig. 21 illustrate the step of "(a) means for programmatically retrieving a runtime parameter for the graph at runtime execution of the graph, the runtime parameter having a value defined as determinable at runtime execution of the graph". Sheard et al. in col. 3, lines 44-50 teach the step of "(b) means for determining whether the value for the runtime parameter is to be provided by user input or is to be externally supplied programmatically;". Sheard et al. in col. 24, lines 45-50 teach the step of "(c) means for displaying a prompt to a user for receiving user input for every runtime parameter so determined to be provided by user input;". Sheard et al. in col. 25, lines 34-50 teach the step of "(d) means for retrieving any externally supplied value for every runtime parameters determined to be externally supplied programmatically; (e) means for determining a final parameter value based on user input to such prompt or such externally supplied value or a default value". Sheard et al. in col. 24, lines 45-50 substantially teach the step of "(f) executing the graph using the first final parameter value as the value for the runtime parameter". Sheard et al. do not explicitly teach the final parameter value of steps (e) and (f). However in view of Poole in col. 79 lines 22-33 teaches the final parameter value based on one of the user input of steps (e) and (f). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Poole into Sheard in order to have a combination of Sheard's methodology that employs a single intuitive user interface that provides various types of

information to users having disparate data input and output requirements, with a significant advantage of the Poole's invention concerns the re-usability of textual, graphical, and other components, thereby providing for the construction of any arbitrary document type having any arbitrary number of presentation formats.

7. Claim 16,

Sheard et al. in abstract teach the step of "further including an interface which permits designating a parameter of a graph component as a runtime parameter".

8. Claim 18,

Sheard et al. in (col. 3, lines 27-44) teach the step of "wherein the expression computes metadata".

9. Claim 22,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 18 and 20 illustrate the step of "a system for modifying a graph at runtime execution of the graph, the graph having vertices representing components with parameters and links between components indicating flows of data between such components the system including: Sheard et al. in Fig. 21 illustrate the step of "(a) means for determining at runtime execution of the graph whether any component of the graph is defined as being an associated conditional component having an associated condition and a condition-interpretation", Sheard et al. in col. 3, lines 44-50 teach the step of "(b) means for evaluating the associated condition for every such conditional component". Sheard et al. in col. 24, lines 45-50 teach the step of "(c) means for modifying the graph at runtime execution of the graph in accordance with such evaluation and the corresponding associated condition-interpretation of at least one such conditional component by removing such conditional component and all connected flows to such

conditional component from the graph before execution of the graph, based on a first evaluation of the associated condition and the corresponding associated condition-interpretation for such conditional component; and (d) mean for executing the modified graph". But Sheard et al. do not explicitly teach the use of final parameter value in step (d). However in view of Poole in col. 79 lines 22-33 teaches the final parameter value based on one of the user input. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Poole into Sheard in order to have a combination of Sheard's methodology that employs a single intuitive user interface that provides various types of information to users having disparate data input and output requirements, with a significant advantage of the Poole's invention concerns the re-usability of textual, graphical, and other components, thereby providing for the construction of any arbitrary document type having any arbitrary number of presentation formats.

10. Claim 25,

See rejection of claim 1. Sheard et al. in Figs. 23 and 24 teach the step of "A system for modifying a graph at runtime execution of the graph, including: Means for determining at runtime execution of the graph whether any component of the graph is defined as being a conditional component having a an associated condition and an associated condition-interpretation; means for evaluating the associated condition for every such conditional component; means for modifying the graph at runtime execution of the graph in accordance with such evaluation and the corresponding associated condition-interpretation of at least one such conditional component by replacing such conditional component with a flow before execution of the graph based on a second evaluation of the associated condition and the corresponding

associated condition-interpretation for such condition component; and means for executing the modified graph." But Sheard et al. do not explicitly teach the use of final parameter value. However in view of Poole in col. 79 lines 22-33 teaches the final parameter value based on one of the user input. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Poole into Sheard in order to have a combination of Sheard's methodology that employs a single intuitive user interface that provides various types of information to users having disparate data input and output requirements, with a significant advantage of the Poole's invention concerns the re-usability of textual, graphical, and other components, thereby providing for the construction of any arbitrary document type having any arbitrary number of presentation formats.

11. Claim 26,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 23 and 24 teach the step of "further including an interface which permits designating a condition and a condition-interpretation for a graph component".

12. Claim 27,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 18 and 20 illustrate the step of "a computer program, stored on a computer-readable medium, for executing a graph representing an executable computer application, the graph having vertices representing components and links between components indicating flows of data between such components the graph further having components with parameters, the computer program comprising instructions for causing a computer to: Sheard et al. in Fig. 21 illustrate the step of "(a) programmatically retrieve a runtime parameter for the graph at runtime execution of the graph, the runtime parameter having a value defined as determinable at runtime execution of the graph". Sheard et al. in col. 3, lines 44-50 teach the step of "(b) determine

whether the value for the runtime parameter is to be provided by user input or is to be externally supplied programmatically;". Sheard et al. in col. 24, lines 45-50 teach the step of "(c) display a prompt to a user for receiving user input for every runtime parameter so determined to be provided by user input;". Sheard et al. in col. 25, lines 34-50 teach the step of "(d) retrieving any externally supplied value for every runtime parameters determined to be externally supplied programmatically; (e) determine a final parameter value based on one of the user input to such prompt or such externally supplied value or a default value;". Sheard et al. in col. 24, lines 45-50 substantially teach the step of "(f) executing the graph using the first final parameter value as the value for the runtime parameter". Sheard et al. do not explicitly teach the final parameter value of steps (e) and (f). However in view of Poole in col. 79 lines 22-33 teaches the final parameter value based on one of the user input of steps (e) and (f). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Poole into Sheard in order to have a combination of Sheard's methodology that employs a single intuitive user interface that provides various types of information to users having disparate data input and output requirements, with a significant advantage of the Poole's invention concerns the re-usability of textual, graphical, and other components, thereby providing for the construction of any arbitrary document type having any arbitrary number of presentation formats.

13. Claim 29,

Sheard et al. in abstract teach the step of "further including instructions for causing the computer to provide an interface which permits designating a parameter of a graph component as a runtime parameter".

14. Claim 31,

Sheard et al. in (col. 3, lines 27-44) teach the step of "wherein the expression computes metadata".

15. Claim 35,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 18 and 20 illustrate the step of "a computer program, stored on a computer-readable medium, for modifying a graph at runtime execution of the graph, the graph having vertices representing with components and links between components indicating flows of data between such components the computer program comprising instructions for causing a computer to: Sheard et al. in Fig. 21 illustrate the step of "(a) determine at runtime execution of the graph whether any component of the graph is defined as being a conditional component having an associated condition and an associated condition interpretation". Sheard et al. in col. 3, lines 44-50 teach the step of "(b) evaluate the associated condition for every such conditional component". Sheard et al. in col. 24, lines 45-50 teach the step of "(c) modify the graph at runtime execution of the graph in accordance with such evaluation and the associated corresponding condition-interpretation of at least one such conditional component by removing such conditional component and all connected flows to such conditional component from the graph before execution of the graph, based on a first evaluation of the associated condition and the corresponding associated condition-interpretation for such conditional component; and (d) executing the modified graph". But Sheard et al. do not explicitly teach the use of final parameter value in step (d). However in view of Poole in col. 79 lines 22-33 teaches the final parameter value based on one of the user input. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Poole into Sheard in order to have a combination of Sheard's methodology that employs a single

intuitive user interface that provides various types of information to users having disparate data input and output requirements, with a significant advantage of the Poole's invention concerns the re-usability of textual, graphical, and other components, thereby providing for the construction of any arbitrary document type having any arbitrary number of presentation formats.

16. Claim 38,

See rejection of claim 1. Sheard et al. in Figs. 23 and 24 teach the step of "A computer program, stored on a computer-readable graph, the computer program comprising instructions for causing a computer to: determine at runtime execution of the graph whether any component of the graph is defined as being a conditional component having a an associated condition and an associated condition-interpretation; evaluate the associated condition for every such conditional component; modify the graph at runtime execution of the graph in accordance with such evaluation and the corresponding associated condition-interpretation of at least one such conditional component by replacing such conditional component with a flow before execution of the graph based on a second evaluation of the associated condition and the corresponding condition interpretation for such conditional component; and execute the modified graph". But Sheard et al. do not explicitly teach the use of final parameter value. However in view of Poole in col. 79 lines 22-33 teaches the final parameter value based on one of the user input. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Poole into Sheard in order to have a combination of Sheard's methodology that employs a single intuitive user interface that provides various types of information to users having disparate data input and output requirements, with a significant advantage of the Poole's invention concerns the

re-usability of textual, graphical, and other components, thereby providing for the construction of any arbitrary document type having any arbitrary number of presentation formats.

17. Claim 39,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 23 and 24 teach the step of "further including instructions for causing the computer to provide an interface which permits designating a condition and a condition interpretation for a graph component".

Claims 4, 8, 11, 17, 21, 24, 30, 34 and 37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheard et al. (herein after referred as a Sheard), in view of Poole et al. (herein after referred as a Poole), and further view of Amado.

18. Claim 4,

Sheard et al. and Poole et al. do not explicitly specify the step of "wherein determining the final parameter value includes evaluating an expression". However, Amado in (col. 35, lines 1-6) teaches evaluating an expression. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. and Poole et al in order to modify the Sheard et al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

19. Claim 8,

Sheard et al. Poole et al. do not explicitly specify the step of "displaying the prompt depends upon evaluation of user input to a prior displayed prompt". However, Amado in (col. 13, lines 18-40) teaches the step. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. and Poole et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

20. Claim 11,

Amado in (col. 13, lines 18-40) teaches the step, "further including removing each component and flows connected to such components that depend on the presence of the removed conditional component". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

21. Claim 17,

Amado in (col. 35, lines 1-6) teaches evaluating an expression. "wherein the means for determining the final parameter value includes means for evaluating an expression". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

22. Claim 21,

Amado in (col. 13, lines 18-40) teaches the step "wherein a prompt for receiving user input is conditional, and displaying the prompt depends upon evaluation of user input to a prior displayed prompt". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

23. Claim 24,

Amado in (col. 13, lines 18-40) teaches the step, "further including means for removing each component and flows connected to such components that depend on the presence of the removed conditional component". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to

be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

24. Claim 30,

Amado in (col. 35, lines 1-6) teaches evaluating an expression. "wherein the instructions for causing the computer to determine the final parameter value include instructions for causing the computer to evaluating an expression". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

25. Claim 34,

Amado in (col. 13, lines 18-40) teaches the step of "wherein a prompt for receiving user input is conditional, and displaying the prompt depends upon evaluation of user input to a prior displayed prompt". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

26. Claim 37,

Amado in (col. 13, lines 18-40) teaches the step, "further including instructions for causing the computer to remove each component and flows connected to such components that depend on the presence of the conditional component". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Javid A Amini whose telephone number is 703-605-4248. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on 703-305-4713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Javid A Amini
Examiner
Art Unit 2672

Javid Amini

JEFFERY BRIER
PRIMARY EXAMINER